

Chiral SU(3) Quark Model Study of Tetraquark States:

$$cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$$

H. X. Zhang[1], W. L. Wang[2], Y.-B. Dai[3] and Z. Y. Zhang[1]

[1]*Institute of High Energy Physics, P.O. Box 918-4,*

Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China

[2]*Institute of Particle Physics, Central China Normal University,*

Wuhan 430079, People's Republic of China

[3]*Institute of Theoretical Physics, P.O. Box 2735,*

Beijing 100080, People's Republic of China

Abstract

The new members of the charm-strange family $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$, $D_{sJ}(2460)$ and $D_s(2632)$, which have the surprising properties, are challenging the present models. Many theoretical interpretations have been devoted to this issue. Most of authors suggest that they are not the conventional $c\bar{s}$ quark model states, but possibly are four-quark states, molecule states or mixtures of a P-wave $c\bar{s}$ and a four-quark state. In this work, we follow the four-quark-state picture, and study the masses of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states (n is u or d quark) in the chiral SU(3) quark model. The numerical results show that the mass of the mixed four-quark state ($cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$) with spin parity $J^P = 0^+$ might not be $D_s(2632)$. At the same time, we also conclude that $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ cannot be explained as the pure four-quark state.

PACS numbers: 21.45.+v, 12.39.-x, 14.40.Lb

Keywords: Four-quark states, Quark model, Chiral symmetry

Suggest heading: Hadronic Physics and QCD

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of several members of low-lying narrow charm-strange meson in experiment has excited great interests of physicists. About three years ago, BABAR Collaboration at SLAC reported the observation of the narrow state $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ [1], and it was confirmed by CLEO Collaboration [2]. At the same time, another narrow state $D_{sJ}(2460)$ was measured by this collaboration. Bell Collaboration at KEK also confirmed these two resonances, and studied their properties later [3], whose results are consistent with the spin-parity assignments of $J^P = 0^+$ for $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $J^P = 1^+$ for $D_{sJ}(2460)$. Subsequently, the SELEX Collaboration reported an evidence for a new puzzling narrow state at a mass of $2632.6 \pm 1.6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ with total width $\Gamma < 17 \text{ MeV}$, which is known as $D_s(2632)$. It decays preferentially to $D_s^+\eta$ rather than to D^+K^0 or D^0K^+ [4]. All these new states have the same surprising properties: (1) they are narrow; (2) their masses are smaller than most theoretical predictions for $c\bar{s}$ states. Besides, $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ have been observed in isospin-violating decay channels. Their surprising properties have attracted much attentions and various theoretical explanations were proposed. Since their masses in the constituent quark model are much higher than the experimental values, some people suggest that they might constitute a new group which is different from the

normal members of the charm-strange family, namely they are not the simple $c\bar{s}$ composition, but possibly are four-quark (4q) states, molecule states or mixtures of 4q states and $c\bar{s}$ [5-10]. In this work, we follow the 4q-state picture.

According to the experiments, $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ decays to $D_s^+\pi^0$ and its $J^P = 0^+$, while $D_{sJ}(2460)$ decays to $D_s^{*+}\pi^0$ and $J^P = 1^+$. Some people propose that $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ component dominates in both two states, where n generically represents either of u, d quark [6]. As for $D_s(2632)$, there are three kinds of suggestions for its quark content. Some authors denote it as $c\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{s}$ [6, 7], others suggest the $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ content [8], and Y.-R. Liu et al. [9] guess that $D_s(2632)$ is a 4q state in the $SU(3)_F$ 15 representation with quark content $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(ds\bar{d} + sdd + su\bar{u} + us\bar{u} - 2ss\bar{s})\bar{c}$. In these papers they only give the qualitative analysis for these three narrow states, and in fact it is very indigent in dynamical study. Thus, we think that it is necessary to study the 4q states based on the QCD-inspired model.

Using the constituent $SU(3)$ quark model, which is quite successful in explaining the baryon spectrum, J. Vijande et al. give a reasonable interpretation for $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ as the mixtures of a P-wave $c\bar{s}$ and a $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ state, but they do not find any states around 2600 MeV [10]. The Chiral $SU(3)$ quark (CSQ) model [11] was proposed by generalizing the idea of the $SU(2)$ σ mode to the flavor $SU(3)$ case, in which the nonet pseudo-scalar meson exchanges and the nonet scalar meson exchanges are considered in describing the medium and long range parts of the interaction, and the one-gluon-exchange (OGE) potential is still retained to contribute the short range repulsion. Since the CSQ model can reasonably reproduce not only the binding energy of deuteron but also the nucleon-nucleon (NN) scattering phase shifts of different

partial waves and the hyperon-nucleon (YN) cross sections by the resonating group method calculations [11, 12], we try to extend this model to study the heavy-light 4q systems.

The CSQ model is based on the constituent quark model of the light quark systems, in which the constituent mass appears because of the vacuum spontaneous breaking, and at the same time the coupling between Goldstone bosons and quarks is automatically introduced for restoring the chiral symmetry and these boson exchanges are essential to obtain a correct description of the NN phenomenology and the light baryon spectrum. But for the heavy quarks, their current masses are very closed to the actual values, this means that their constituent part is very small and the vacuum spontaneous breaking effect is not important. Therefore, for the light quark systems, the Goldstone boson exchanges are necessary to be considered, but for the heavy quark systems, the one-gluon-exchange interaction between quarks and the confinement potential are enough to describe their main properties. This basic framework is consistent with the QCD inspire and it is the usual treatment in many works. For the heavy-light quark systems, whether the chiral $SU(3)$ quark model should be extended to chiral $SU(4)$ by including D mesons or not? In our opinion, at least as the first step, the Goldstone boson exchange between light and heavy quarks is unnecessary to be considered, because the coupling between heavy quark and Goldstone boson is unimportant and the masses of D mesons are quite large, located inside the chiral symmetry scale, which is regarded about $(0.15 - 0.2 fm)^{-1}$ usually. Therefore, Goldstone boson exchanges will not be considered in the heavy-light quark systems.

In this work, 4q states with quark content $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ are studied. The pa-

parameters for the light quark pairs are taken from our previous work, and for the heavy-light quark pairs they are obtained from fitting the masses of D , D^* , D_s , D_s^* , η_c , J/Ψ and $h_1(1p)$, which will be introduced detailedly in the theoretical framework. Considering $D_s(2632)$ as a mixture of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ 4q states, we compute its mass which is about 90MeV higher than the experimental value. Moreover, we show that $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ cannot be explained as the 4q state in our model.

Finally, we repeat our calculation in the extended CSQ model [12] which is proposed by extending the CSQ model to involve vector meson exchanges. In addition, the OGE which dominantly governs the short-range quark-quark (qq) or quark-antiquark ($q\bar{q}$) interaction in the original CSQ model, is now nearly replaced by the vector meson exchanges. Using this model, a challenging problem, whether OGE or vector meson exchange is the right mechanism for describing the short range part of the strong interaction, or both of them are important, is studied. For the light quark systems, from study of baryon-baryon scattering processes to the baryon-meson systems in the extended CSQ model, some results are similar to those given by the chiral unitary approach study [13]. Thus, in this paper, we also try to calculate the heavy-light 4q states in this extended model. We conclude that it is not suitable to study the physics of heavy-light quark systems in the extended CSQ model.

The paper is arranged as follows. The theoretical framework of the CSQ model, the determination of parameters and the wave functions for $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states are briefly introduced in Section II. The numerical results are listed and discussed in Section III. Finally summary is shown in Section IV.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. The model

In our CSQ model, the Hamiltonian of a 4q system is written as

$$H = \sum_i m_i + \sum_i T_i - T_G + \sum_{i < j=1}^4 V_{ij} , \quad (1)$$

where m_i is the mass of the i th quark, T_G is the kinetic energy operator for the c.m. motion, and V_{ij} represents the interactions between qq or $q\bar{q}$. As for qq pair, $V_{ij} = V_{ij}^{conf} + V_{ij}^{OGE} + V_{ij}^{ch}$, where the confinement potential V_{ij}^{conf} , which provides the non-perturbative QCD effect in the long distance, is taken as linear form in this work, namely

$$V_{ij}^{conf} = -(\lambda_i^c \cdot \lambda_j^c)(a_{ij}r_{ij} + a_{ij}^0) . \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the expression of OGE potential V_{ij}^{OGE} is

$$V_{ij}^{OGE} = \frac{1}{4}g_i g_j (\lambda_i^c \cdot \lambda_j^c) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_{ij}} - \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{1}{m_i^2} + \frac{1}{m_j^2} + \frac{4(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j)}{3m_i m_j} \right) \delta(\vec{r}_{ij}) \right\} , \quad (3)$$

which governs the short-range perturbative QCD behavior. $g_i g_j$ is the OGE coupling constant, which is an effective form of the momentum-dependant quark-gluon coupling strength α_s , and it is frozen for each flavor sector. V_{ij}^{ch} represents the interactions from chiral field coupling and describes the non-perturbative QCD effect of the low-momentum medium-distance range, which can be expressed as

$$V_{ij}^{ch} = \sum_{a=0}^8 V_{s_a}(\vec{r}_{ij}) + \sum_{a=0}^8 V_{ps_a}(\vec{r}_{ij}) , \quad (4)$$

where

$$V_{s_a}(\vec{r}_{ij}) = -C(g_{ch}, m_{s_a}, \Lambda)(\lambda_i^a \cdot \lambda_j^c)X_1(m_{s_a}, \Lambda, r_{ij}) + V_{s_a}^{ls}(\vec{r}_{ij}) , \quad (5)$$

$$V_{ps_a}(\vec{r}_{ij}) = C(g_{ch}, m_{ps_a}, \Lambda)(\lambda_i^a \cdot \lambda_j^c) \frac{m_{ps_a}^2}{12m_{q_i}m_{q_j}} X_2(m_{ps_a}, \Lambda, r_{ij})(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j) + V_{ps_a}^{ten}(\vec{r}_{ij}) , \quad (6)$$

with

$$C(g_{ch}, m, \Lambda) = \frac{g_{ch}^2}{4\pi} \frac{\Lambda^2 m}{\Lambda^2 - m^2} , \quad (7)$$

$$X_1(m, \Lambda, r) = Y(mr) - \frac{\Lambda}{m} Y(\Lambda r) , \quad (8)$$

$$X_2(m, \Lambda, r) = Y(mr) - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{m}\right)^3 Y(\Lambda r) , \quad (9)$$

$$Y(x) = \frac{1}{x} e^{-x} , \quad (10)$$

and m_{s_a} (m_{ps_a}) is the mass of the scalar (pseudoscalar) meson.

The interactions for $q\bar{q}$ pair include two parts: direct interaction and annihilation part

$$V_{q\bar{q}} = V_{q\bar{q}}^{dir} + V_{q\bar{q}}^{ann} , \quad (11)$$

$$V_{q\bar{q}}^{dir} = V_{q\bar{q}}^{conf} + V_{q\bar{q}}^{OGE} + V_{q\bar{q}}^{ch} . \quad (12)$$

In this work, we neglect the contribution of annihilation part firstly. The detailed expression of $V_{q\bar{q}}^{dir}$ can be obtained from V_{qq} . As for $V_{q\bar{q}}^{conf}$ and $V_{q\bar{q}}^{OGE}$, the transformation from V_{qq} to $V_{q\bar{q}}$ is given by $\lambda_i^c \cdot \lambda_j^c \rightarrow -\lambda_i^c \cdot \lambda_j^{*c}$, while for $V_{q\bar{q}}^{ch}$ it is $\lambda_i^a \cdot \lambda_j^a \rightarrow \lambda_i^a \cdot \lambda_j^{*a}$.

Once perturbative (OGE) and non-perturbative (confinement and chiral symmetry breaking) aspects of QCD have been considered, one ends up with a $q_i q_j$ interaction of the form

$$V_{q_i q_j} = \begin{cases} q_i q_j = n\bar{n}, n\bar{s}, s\bar{s}, \bar{n}\bar{s}, \bar{s}\bar{s} \Rightarrow V_{q_i q_j}^{conf} + V_{q_i q_j}^{OGE} + V_{q_i q_j}^{ch} \\ q_i q_j = cn, cs, c\bar{n}, c\bar{s} \Rightarrow V_{q_i q_j}^{conf} + V_{q_i q_j}^{OGE} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Note that for the heavy-light quark pairs, the Goldstone boson exchanges will not be considered.

B. Determination of the parameters

The interaction parameters include the OGE coupling constant g_i , the confinement strengths a_{ij} ; a_{ij}^0 , and the chiral coupling constant g_{ch} . In our 4q systems, there are three light quarks (u, d, s) and one heavy quark (c). From Eq. (13), there are three kinds of interactions in the light quark pairs, i.e. confining potential, OGE potential and chiral potential, while for the heavy-light quark pairs the latter one will not be considered.

(1). The parameters for the light quark pairs (Set I)

The parameters for the light quark pairs are taken from our previous work [14], which gave a satisfactory description for the energies of the baryon ground states, the binding energy of the deuteron (B_{deu}), the NN scattering phase shifts, and the YN cross section. The procedure for parameters determination is listed in Ref. [14, 15] in detail. For simplicity, we only show them in Table I. The theoretical results for the energies of baryon ground states and B_{deu} are shown in Table II. In our calculation, η and η' mesons are mixed by η_1 and η_8 , the mixing angle θ_{ps} is taken to be the usual value with $\theta_{ps} = -23^\circ$. Here the scalar meson mixing is not considered, i.e. $\theta_s = 0$. The coupling constant for scalar and pseudo-scalar chiral field coupling, g_{ch} , is determined according to the relation $\frac{g_{ch}^2}{4\pi} = \frac{9}{25} \frac{g_{NN\pi}}{4\pi} \frac{m_\pi^2}{M_N^2}$.

(2). The parameters for the heavy-light quark pairs (Set II)

In order to obtain the OGE coupling constant g_c in the heavy-light quark pairs,

TABLE I: Model parameters for the light quark pairs (Set I). The masses of u (d) and s quark: $m_u = m_d = 313\text{MeV}$, $m_s = 470\text{MeV}$. The meson masses and the cut-off: $m_{\sigma'} = m_\epsilon = m_\kappa = 980\text{MeV}$, $m_\pi = 138\text{MeV}$, $m_K = 495\text{MeV}$, $m_\eta = 549\text{MeV}$, $m_{\eta'} = 957\text{MeV}$, and $\Lambda = 1100\text{MeV}$.

Model Parameters (Set I)	
b_u (fm)	0.5
m_σ (MeV)	595
θ_{ps}	-23^0
θ_s	0
$g_{NN\pi}$	13.67
$g_u; g_s$	0.886; 0.917
a_{uu} (MeV/fm)	90.41
a_{uu}^0 (MeV)	-79.66
a_{us} (MeV/fm)	104.2
a_{us}^0 (MeV)	-76.19
a_{ss} (MeV/fm)	155.3
a_{ss}^0 (MeV)	-86.70

TABLE II: The energies of the baryon ground states and the binding energy of deuteron.

	N	Σ	Ξ	Λ	Δ	Σ^*	Ξ^*	Ω	B_{deu}
Exp. (MeV)	939	1194	1319	1116	1232	1385	1530	1672	2.224
Theor. (MeV)	939	1194	1334	1116	1237	1375	1515	1657	2.13

we refer to the effective scale-dependent strong coupling constant in Ref. [10], i.e.

$$\alpha_s(\mu_{ij}) = \frac{\alpha_0}{\ln [(\mu_{ij}^2 + \mu_0^2)/\Lambda_0^2]} , \quad (14)$$

where μ_{ij} is the reduced mass of the qq ($q\bar{q}$) system and α_0 , μ_0 and Λ_0 are fitted parameters. $\alpha_s(\mu_{ij})$ is fitted to the behavior of the standard expression for the running coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$. In Eq. (14) the typical momentum scale of each flavor sector is assimilated to the reduced mass of the system. Because $g_i g_j$ is also an effective form of α_s , according to the numerical results of $\alpha_s(\mu_{cc})$, $\alpha_s(\mu_{cu})$ and $\alpha_s(\mu_{cs})$ we can estimate a rough range for g_c : $0.53 \sim 0.6$ with $m_c = 1300 \sim 1700 \text{ MeV}$.

In the case of the confinement strengths $a_{cu}; a_{cu}^0$, $a_{cs}; a_{cs}^0$ and $a_{cc}; a_{cc}^0$, as a preliminary sample, we fix them by fitting the masses of D , D^* , D_s , D_s^* , η_c , J/Ψ and $h_c(1p)$. In order to avoid an unbound spectrum, the delta-function in OGE potential has to be regularized, namely

$$\delta(\vec{r}_{ij}) \Rightarrow \frac{1}{4\pi} \Lambda_{ij}^3 Y(\Lambda_{ij} r_{ij}) ,$$

where $Y(x) = e^{-x}/x$, and $\Lambda_{ij} = \mu_{ij}/\hat{r}_0$ that follows by the flavor-dependent regularization $r_0(\mu)$ in Ref. [10]. In this work, we choose $g_c = 0.58$ and $m_c = 1430 \text{ MeV}$ to calculation. The numerical results of the confinement strengths and masses of D , D^* , D_s , D_s^* , η_c , J/Ψ and $h_c(1p)$ are shown in Table III and IV, respectively. From Table IV, it is seen that the masses of these states are reasonably consistent with the experimental values.

Summing up the parameters for the light quark pairs and the heavy-light quark pairs, the parameter group for 4q states calculation is Set I+Set II.

TABLE III: Model parameters for the heavy-light quark pairs (Set II). $m_c = 1430 \text{ MeV}$.

Model Parameters (Set II)	
a_{cu} (MeV/fm)	275
a_{cu}^0 (MeV)	-155.9
a_{cs} (MeV/fm)	275
a_{cs}^0 (MeV)	-124.7
a_{cc} (MeV/fm)	275
a_{cc}^0 (MeV)	-77.8

TABLE IV: The masses of D , D^* , D_s , D_s^* , η_c , J/Ψ and $h_c(1p)$. Experimental data are taken from PDG.

Mesons	D	D^*	D_s	D_s^*	η_c	J/Ψ	$h_c(1p)$
Exp. (MeV)	1867.7	2008.9	1968.5	2112.4	2979.6	3096.916	3526.21
Theor. (MeV)	1888	2009	1969	2130	2990	3098	3568

C. The wave functions of 4q states: $(cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s})$

As for a 4q state $(q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4)$, the wave function will be a tensor product of a spatial (ϕ^S) , flavor (ϕ^F) , spin (χ_s) and color (χ_C) wave functions

$$|\Psi_{q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4}\rangle = \phi^S(q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4) \phi^F(q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4) \chi_s(q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4) \chi_C(q_1 q_2 \bar{q}_3 \bar{q}_4).$$

With respect to the color wave function, one can couple the two quarks and the two antiquarks to a color singlet 4q state in different ways: (1) $\{|1_{13}, 1_{24}\rangle, |8_{13}, 8_{24}\rangle\}$, (2) $\{|1_{14}, 1_{23}\rangle, |8_{14}, 8_{23}\rangle\}$ and (3) $\{|\bar{3}_{12}, 3_{34}\rangle, |6_{12}, \bar{6}_{34}\rangle\}$. As for the 4q states $(cn\bar{n}\bar{s})$

and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$) we study in this paper, the wave function of antiquark pair ($\bar{n}\bar{s}$ or $\bar{s}\bar{s}$) should be antisymmetric in the CSQ model. The expression (3) is more convenient to treat the anti-symmetrization of the two antiquarks. Thus, we start from expression (3), then consider the configuration mixing between the states with the same quantum numbers.

Let us describe the wave function of a 4q state as the following form

$$\Psi(4q) = \psi_{4q}(0s^4) [(qq)_{I_1, S_1, C_1}; (\bar{q}\bar{q})_{I_2, S_2, C_2}]_{I, S, (00)^C} ,$$

where $\psi_{4q}(0s^4)$ is the orbital part and all the four quarks are in S-wave state, $[(qq)_{I_1, S_1, C_1}; (\bar{q}\bar{q})_{I_2, S_2, C_2}]_{I, S, C}$ is the flavor-spin-color part and the wave function of antiquark pair $(\bar{q}\bar{q})_{I_2, S_2, C_2}$ should be antisymmetric. For example, if the $\bar{q}\bar{q}$ pair is symmetric in flavor ($((02)^F)$), due to the Pauli principle the color-spin wave function of the pair should be antisymmetric, i.e. antisymmetric in color ($C_2 = (10)^C$), symmetric in spin ($S_2 = 1$) or symmetric in color ($C_2 = (02)^C$), antisymmetric in spin ($S_2 = 0$). For the 4q wave function, the isospin-spin-color quantum numbers (I_1, S_1, C_1) for the qq pair and (I_2, S_2, C_2) for the $\bar{q}\bar{q}$ pair should be combined to form a color singlet ($I, S, (00)^C$). Therefore, as for $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ with quantum numbers $(J^P; I) = (0^+; 0)$, the possible configurations are read

$$\Psi_A = \psi_{cn\bar{n}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cn)_{\frac{1}{2}, 0, (01)^C}; (\bar{n}\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2}, 0, (10)^C}^{(10)^F} \right]_{0, 0, (00)^C} , \quad (15)$$

$$\Psi_B = \psi_{cn\bar{n}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cn)_{\frac{1}{2}, 1, (20)^C}; (\bar{n}\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2}, 1, (02)^C}^{(10)^F} \right]_{0, 0, (00)^C} , \quad (16)$$

$$\Psi_C = \psi_{cn\bar{n}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cn)_{\frac{1}{2}, 0, (20)^C}; (\bar{n}\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2}, 0, (02)^C}^{(02)^F} \right]_{0, 0, (00)^C} , \quad (17)$$

$$\Psi_D = \psi_{cn\bar{n}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cn)_{\frac{1}{2}, 1, (01)^C}; (\bar{n}\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2}, 1, (10)^C}^{(02)^F} \right]_{0, 0, (00)^C} , \quad (18)$$

where $(\bar{n}\bar{s})^{(10)^F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{n}\bar{s} - \bar{s}\bar{n})$, and $(\bar{n}\bar{s})^{(02)^F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{n}\bar{s} + \bar{s}\bar{n})$. Similarly, the wave functions for $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states are

$$\Psi_E = \psi_{cs\bar{s}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cs)_{0,0,(20)^C}; (\bar{s}\bar{s})_{0,0,(02)^C} \right]_{0,0,(00)^C}, \quad (19)$$

$$\Psi_F = \psi_{cs\bar{s}\bar{s}}(0s^4) \left[(cs)_{0,1,(01)^C}; (\bar{s}\bar{s})_{0,1,(10)^C} \right]_{0,0,(00)^C}. \quad (20)$$

As for other quantum numbers, such as $(J^P; I) = (0^+; 1)$, $(1^+; 0)$ and $(1^+; 1)$, the wave functions can be written out following the same rule. For saving space, we will not show them in here.

Of cause, it is necessary to re-couple the color basis from $\{|\bar{3}_{12}, 3_{34} \rangle, |6_{12}, \bar{6}_{34} \rangle\}$ to $\{|1_{13}, 1_{24} \rangle, |8_{13}, 8_{24} \rangle\}$ to calculate the interactions of $q\bar{q}$ pair in our calculation. At the same time, the re-coupling expression is useful to make the physical meaning of the state obviously. For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A = & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\psi_{c\bar{n}\bar{n}\bar{s}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{n})_{\frac{1}{2},0,(00)^C}; (n\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2},0,(00)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\psi_{c\bar{s}n\bar{n}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{s})_{0,0,(00)^C}; (n\bar{n})_{0,0,(00)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\psi_{c\bar{n}n\bar{s}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{n})_{\frac{1}{2},1,(00)^C}; (n\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2},1,(00)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\psi_{c\bar{s}n\bar{n}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{s})_{0,1,(00)^C}; (n\bar{n})_{0,1,(00)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & +\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\psi_{c\bar{n}n\bar{s}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{n})_{\frac{1}{2},0,(11)^C}; (n\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2},0,(11)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & +\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\psi_{c\bar{s}n\bar{n}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{s})_{0,0,(11)^C}; (n\bar{n})_{0,0,(11)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\psi_{c\bar{n}n\bar{s}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{n})_{\frac{1}{2},1,(11)^C}; (n\bar{s})_{\frac{1}{2},1,(11)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C} \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\psi_{c\bar{s}n\bar{n}}(0s^4)[(c\bar{s})_{0,1,(11)^C}; (n\bar{n})_{0,1,(11)^C}]_{0,0,(00)^C}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the first four rows in Ψ_A describe physics mesons, and the last ones are the color octet $q\bar{q}$ sector.

The trial wave function can be written as an expression of the 4q state with several different harmonic oscillator frequencies ω_i ,

$$\psi_{4q} = \sum_i^n \alpha_i \phi_{4q}(b_i),$$

where $b_i^2 = \frac{1}{m\omega_i}$. Using the variation method the energies of these states are obtained.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the experiments of $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$, a natural interpretation is that they are P-wave $c\bar{s}$ quark states, and their spin-parity are $J^P = 0^+$ and 1^+ , respectively [16]. Now, if we regard them as 4q states, according to their decay modes their quark contents are $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$. Because of their isospin-violating decay channel, we focus our calculation on such quantum numbers: $(J^P; I) = (0^+, 0)$, $(0^+, 1)$, $(1^+, 0)$ and $(1^+, 1)$. The rms radii ($\langle r \rangle$ in fm) and masses (M in MeV) of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ states are calculated and the numerical results are listed in the first row of Table V. From the first two numerical values, the masses of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ state with $J^P = 0^+$ are much higher than the mass of $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ whether its isospin is 0 or 1. Therefore, we conclude that it is difficult to explain $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ as a pure 4q state in our calculation. From the last numerical values, the same conclusion can be obtained for $D_{sJ}(2460)$. This conclusion is consistent with the generally acceptable opinion about these two surprising charm-strange mesons. Since there is no compelling evidence that $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ are nonconventional meson states, it is still possible to interpret them as $c\bar{s}$ states or the mixtures of $c\bar{s}$ and 4q states.

$D_s(2632)$ was regarded as one of excellent candidates for the tetraquark, and many

TABLE V: The rms radii and masses ($\langle r \rangle; M$) (fm; MeV) for $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states with quantum numbers $(J^P; I)=(0^+; 0)$, $(0^+; 1)$, $(1^+; 0)$ and $(1^+; 1)$.

4q states	$(0^+; 0)$	$(0^+; 1)$	$(1^+; 0)$	$(1^+; 1)$
$cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$	(0.428; 2753)	(0.445; 2782)	(0.457; 2882)	(0.488; 2925)
$cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$	(0.393; 3124)	—	(0.370; 3065)	—
$cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$	(0.417; 2729)	—	(0.445; 2870)	—

theoretical interpretations have been devoted to this issue. Some people suggest that the $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ component dominates in $D_s(2632)$, and others denote its quark content as $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$. However, most of works are the qualitative analysis, not the dynamical calculation based on a QCD-inspired model. We study the mass of $D_s(2632)$ as a mixture of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states in the CSQ model. According to the decay modes of $D_s(2632)$ both particles in the final states are pseudo-scalar mesons, thus it is probably an isoscalar. Namely, in this calculation we focus on $(J^P; I) = (0^+; 0)$. Firstly, the masses of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states are calculated where the configuration mixing between the states with same quantum numbers is considered, and the numerical results are shown in the first column of Table V. It is seen that the masses of both states are higher than 2632MeV, especially the mass of $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$. Thus $D_s(2632)$ cannot be explained as $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ or $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ component alone in our calculation.

Is it possible that $D_s(2632)$ is a mixture of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$? And in the CSQ model whether both states can mix together or not? Firstly, let us discuss the possible decay modes of the mixed state. In principle, the allowed decay modes depend on the relationship between the tetraquark mass and the sum of the masses of the

possible decay products. In the case of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ with $(J^P; I) = (0^+; 0)$, let us take Ψ_A as an example, from the first four rows of Eq. (21), the possible decay products are $D + K$, $D_s + \eta(n\bar{n})$, $D^* + K^*$ and $D_s^* + \omega(n\bar{n})$. Since $M_{cn\bar{n}\bar{s}}$ is larger than $M_D + M_K$ or $M_{D_s} + M_\eta$ and smaller than $M_{D^*} + M_{K^*}$ or $M_{D_s^*} + M_\omega$, the possible decay modes of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ are $D + K$ and $D_s + \eta$. Similarly, we can obtain the decay mode of $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ is $D_s + \eta(s\bar{s})$. Thus, the mixed state can decay into $D + K$ and $D_s + \eta$ which is the same as $D_s(2632)$'s decay modes. Secondly, it is allowable that $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ can mix together through meson-exchange and annihilation mechanics in our model. Therefore, $D_s(2632)$ can be regarded as a mixture of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$. In this work, the contributions of K and κ meson exchanges between $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states are taken into account, firstly, and the contributions of annihilation mechanics are neglected. The numerical results are listed in Table V. It is seen that the mass of the mixed state is 2729MeV, and its rms radius is 0.417fm which is a reasonable and acceptable size for heavy-light 4q systems. If we change g_c little higher, for example, $g_c = 0.6$, the mass will be down about several MeV.

Up to now, there are many assignments to describe $D_s(2632)$, however, the masses and peculiar strong branching fractions reported for this state appear inconsistent with any of these assignments. In this work, we give a preliminary estimation to the strong branching fraction firstly. According to our calculation, if $D_s(2632)$ is the mixture of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$, its mass is 2729MeV with about 95.8% of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ content. Namely, $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ is the dominant component in $D_s(2632)$. As an example, from Ψ_A in Eq. (21), we know that the rates for $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ decay into $D(c\bar{n}) + K(n\bar{s})$ and $D_s^+(c\bar{s}) + \eta(n\bar{n})$ is equal and $n\bar{n}$ component is a very small part in η meson. Thus, it seems that the $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ mixed state should not dominantly decay into $D_s^+\eta$. In other words,

the strong decay branching fraction in our calculation might also disagree with the SELEX data. Since $D_s(2632)$ is not confirmed further by other laboratories, as for the mixed state at a mass of 2729MeV with $J^P = 0^+$ which is obtained in our calculation, is it another tetraquark state? This should be answered by advanced experiments. Since the rms radii of heavy-light 4q states we study now is about 0.4fm, at such short distance the annihilation mechanism should be considered. Besides, $c\bar{s}$ states might play a role in the $D_s(2632)$. All these aspects, which will be considered in the next step, might improve our calculation.

In addition, we also calculate the mass of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ state with $(J^P; I) = (1^+; 0)$, and the numerical results are listed in the third column of Table V. It is seen that the mass of this state is 2870MeV and its rms radius is 0.445fm. Namely, as for the vector partner of $D_s(2632)$, its mass is about 2870MeV in our model, which is about one hundred MeV higher than the predicted result in Ref. [6].

In order to improve our feeling on studying 4q states in the CSQ model, we try several groups of parameters to repeat our calculation. The parameters are all roughly consistent with the masses of D , D^* , D_s , D_s^* , η_c , J/Ψ and $h_c(1p)$. They will bring some differences on the results of the 4q states we studied, but the influences are not big and the qualitative results are almost the same.

Finally, we try to study the 4q states in the extended CSQ model [13] where besides the nonet pseudo-scalar meson fields and the nonet scalar meson fields, the coupling among vector meson fields with quarks is also considered. The masses we obtained are roughly 200 $\sim$ 400 MeV higher than the results in the CSQ model. The reasons are as follows: in the extended CSQ model the OGE potential which

dominantly governs the short-range qq ($q\bar{q}$) interaction in the original CSQ model, is now nearly replaced by the vector meson exchanges. In the light quark systems it can also give a reasonable interpretation for physical processes. However, for the heavy-light quark systems, the Goldstone boson exchanges do not contribute. If the contribution of OGE potential in the heavy-light quark pairs is almost neglected, only confining potential cannot give a reasonable description to the interactions. Thus, it is not suitable to study heavy-light 4q systems in the extended CSQ model. Until now, the extended CSQ model can do well in light quark systems. It seems that OGE potential or vector meson exchanges can independently govern the short-range qq ($q\bar{q}$) interaction. However, besides the confinement potential, the contribution of OGE is unique to describe the qq or $q\bar{q}$ interactions as the chiral symmetry is exactly broken. Which is the real short-range-mechanism of all the qq ($q\bar{q}$) interaction? We think that it is also an open question in our future research.

IV. SUMMARY

In this work, we study the masses of $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ 4q states in the CSQ model, and try to give a reasonable interpretation to $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$, $D_{sJ}(2460)$ and $D_s(2632)$. The numerical results show that $D_{sJ}^*(2317)$ and $D_{sJ}(2460)$ cannot be explained as the pure 4q state, which is consistent with the general acceptable opinion about these two surprising charm-strange mesons. We suggest that the mixed $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}/cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ 4q state with $(J^P; I) = (0^+; 0)$, which mass is 2729MeV and about 90MeV higher than the experimental mass of $D_s(2632)$, might be a tetraquark state. In addition, we note that it is not suitable for studying the heavy-light quark systems in the extended

CSQ model.

In our present calculation, only the contribution of meson-exchange between $cn\bar{n}\bar{s}$ and $cs\bar{s}\bar{s}$ state is considered. Because of the small size of the 4q states the contribution of annihilation mechanics should be taken into account. Besides, followed by Ref. [10], P-wave $c\bar{s}$ state in these puzzling charm-strange mesons can play a role. The effects of both two aspects will be study in next step to improve our calculation.

So far $D_s(2632)$ is not confirmed by other laboratories, so the future experimental studies will be crucial for understanding it. The most important measurement, such as determination of the J^P quantum numbers, could test the theoretical calculation.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are in debt to Professor Y. W. Yu and Dr. F. Huang for stimulating discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China: No. 10475087.

-
- [1] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 242001 (2003).
 - [2] CLEO Collaboration, D. Besson et al. Phys. Rev. D **68**, 032002 (2003).
 - [3] Belle Collaboraton, P. Krokovny, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 262002 (2003); Belle Collaboration, Y. Mikani, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 012002 (2004).
 - [4] SELEX Collaboration, A.V. Evdokimov, et al. Phys. Rev. lett. **93**, 242001 (2004).
 - [5] F. E. Close, Inter. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 5156 (2005); T. Barnes, F. E. Close, J. J.

- Dudek, S. Godfrey and E. S. Swanson, Phys. Lett. B **600**, 223 (2004) and reference therein; T. Barnes, F. E. Close and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054006 (2003).
- [6] Y. Q. Chen and X. Q. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 232001 (2004) and the references therein.
- [7] V. Gupta, Inter. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 5891 (2005).
- [8] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 054009 (2004).
- [9] Y.-R. Liu, S. L. Zhu, Y.-B. Dai and C. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 094009 (2004).
- [10] J. Vijande, F. Fernández and A. Valcarce, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 034002 (2006) and references therein.
- [11] Z. Y. Zhang, Y. W. Yu, P. N. Shen L. R. Dai, A. Faessler and U. Straub, Nucl. Phys. **A625**, 59 (1997); Z. Y. Zhang, Y. W. Yu, L. R. Dai, High Energy Phys. Nucl. Phys. **20**, 393 (1996).
- [12] L. R. Dai, Z. Y. Zhang, Y. W. Yu and P. Wang, Nucl. Phys. **A727**, 321 (2003).
- [13] F. Huang and Z. Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 064004 (2004); *ibid.*, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 068201 (2005); F. Huang, D. Zhang, Z. Y. Zhang and Y. W. Yu, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 064001 (2005).
- [14] F. Huang, D. Zhang, Z. Y. Zhang and Y. W. Yu, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 064001 (2005).
- [15] D. Zhang, F. Huang, Z. Y. Zhang and Y. W. Yu, Nucl. Phys. **A756**, 215 (2005).
- [16] A. Pompili, hep-ex/0311036; F. Porter, Eur. Phys. J. C **33**, s219 (2004).